

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23, 25-27, 29-31 and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani (JP 9-96872) in view of Kenji (JP 06038151); Claims 14, 18, 22, 28, 32 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani in view of Kenji and further in view of Hori (USP 6,348,993) and Claim 24 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani in view of Kenji. Claims 1-18 have now been canceled, without prejudice and thus, Claims 19-36 remain active.

Considering first then the rejection of Claims 11-13, 15-17, 19-21, 23, 25-27, 29-31 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani in view of Kenji, it is to be noted that each of independent Claims 19, 25, 29 and 23 have now been amended so as to claim at least one protrusion formed in a Fresnel lens sheet and claim the Lenticular lens sheet as having a hollow place into which the protrusion is fitted wherein the protrusion and the hollow place are each positioned outside the screen image effective region of the screen. In addition, a gap is claimed as being formed between the Fresnel lens sheet and the Lenticular lens sheet throughout the entire area of the screen image effective region. Insofar as a review of Mitani, Kenji and the remaining references of record fails to indicate a teaching or disclosure of the above-emphasized limitations, it is respectfully submitted that each of the independent claims (i.e., Claims 19, 25, 29 and 23) now merit indication of allowability.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 14, 18, 22, 28, 32 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani in view of Kenji and further in view of Hori and the rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mitani in

view2 of Kenji, it is respectfully submitted that Hori fails to rectify the deficiencies noted hereinabove with regard to Kenji and Mitani. In this regard, it is noted that Hori has been cited solely for the teaching of the utilization of an acrylic resin, polycarbonate resin or the like.

In view of the foregoing an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
James D. Hamilton  
Registration No. 28,421

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
JDH/rac

I:\ATTY\JDH\238477US-AM.DOC